UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/909,630	07/19/2001	Yakov Kamen	007287.00016	9979
22907 BANNER & W	7590 07/29/200 ITCOFF, LTD.	EXAMINER		
1100 13th STRI		CASCHERA, ANTONIO A		
SUITE 1200 WASHINGTON, DC 20005-4051			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2628	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			07/29/2009	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.		Applicant(s)	
	09/909,630	KAMEN, YAKOV	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Antonio A. Caschera	2628	

	Antonio A. Caschera	2628	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the o	correspondence add	ress
THE REPLY FILED <u>20 July 2009</u> FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPL	ICATION IN CONDITION FOR AL	LOWANCE.	
1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on application, applicant must timely file one of the following application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appelor Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 Coperiods:	the same day as filing a Notice of a replies: (1) an amendment, affidavi eal (with appeal fee) in compliance	Appeal. To avoid abar t, or other evidence, w with 37 CFR 41.31; or	hich places the (3) a Request
a) The period for reply expires <u>3</u> months from the mailing date	of the final rejection.		
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire la Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(the content of the co	dvisory Action, or (2) the date set forth ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailing b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE	g date of the final rejectio	n.
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date thave been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extunder 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL	ension and the corresponding amount of hortened statutory period for reply origing than three months after the mailing date.	of the fee. The appropria nally set in the final Offic	te extension fee e action; or (2) as
 The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exter Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed with AMENDMENTS 	nsion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of the	
3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, be	out prior to the date of filing a brief	will not be entered be	cause
(a) ☐ They raise new issues that would require further cor			cause
(b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below	•	, ,	
(c) They are not deemed to place the application in bet appeal; and/or		ducing or simplifying th	ne issues for
(d) They present additional claims without canceling a c	corresponding number of finally reje	ected claims.	
NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).		I' (A) (/#	TOL 004)
 The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12 Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): 		mpliant Amendment (F	PTOL-324).
6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be all non-allowable claim(s).		timely filed amendmer	t canceling the
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) [how the new or amended claims would be rejected is prov. The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:		l be entered and an ex	planation of
Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to: <u>2-7,12-17 and 22-27</u> .			
Claim(s) rejected: <u>1,11 and 21</u> . Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:			
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE	thefere or on the data of filing a Nic	ation of Annaal will not	ha antarad
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, bu because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e). 			
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to o showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary 	vercome <u>all</u> rejections under appea and was not earlier presented. Se	al and/or appellant fails see 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1)	s to provide a
10.	n of the status of the claims after er	ntry is below or attache	ed.
 The request for reconsideration has been considered but see continuation sheet. 	does NOT place the application in	condition for allowand	ce because:
12.	PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)		
	/Antonio A Caschera/ Primary Examiner, Art U	Init 2628	

continuation of no. 7: The claims would be rejected as seen in the Final Office Action of 04/21/09.

continuation of no. 11: Applicant's Remarks are persuasive to overcome the 35 USC 101 rejection and 35 USC 112, 1st paragraph rejection of the claims. Applicant's Remarks are not persuasive, however, to overcome the 35 USC 103 rejection of claims 1, 11 and 21 in view of Jeong et al. and Schein et al.. Applicant argues that neither reference teacesh the limitation of modifying a non-textual attribute associated with the object by an incremental amount for each of at least two times that the object is selected, wherein the non-textual attribute after each modification visually indicates a number of times the object has been selected. The Examiner disagrees and points to Jeong et al.'s disclosure of the volume control graphics. The Examiner points to the situations wherein a user selects the volume control to a maximum number/volume thus exhibiting "a maximum number of times" shown by the volume bar of Jeong et al. at "full" filled length position and then the user selects the volume control one less than a maximum number volume thus exhibiting a "one less than a number of times" selected and shown by the volume bar being almost fully filled in length. This is clearly seen as disclosing Applicant's argued limitation and thus the Examiner maintains the current rejection based upon Jeong et al. and Schein et al..